

## REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Claim 1 has been amended so as to be limited to the organocyclic silicon compound (D-1) recited in former claim 1. The subject matter of claim 2 has furthermore been incorporated into claim 1. The remainder of the claims have been amended so as to be consistent with claim 1 as amended.

Claims 1, 3-4 and 6-13 are pending after the foregoing amendments.

Since the foregoing amendments are solely based upon limitations present in the claims prior to issuance of the final rejection, it is respectfully submitted that entry and consideration of the foregoing amendments is appropriate, even though the application is under final rejection.

Turning to the Official Action, claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103 as obvious over Fehn et al. for the reasons set forth in item 7. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

### In re cited Fehn et al. (US 6,187,890)

In column 9, lines 46-61, Fehn et al. give illustrative examples of the inhibitors and stabilizers which can be added to the composition of Fehn et al. The compound 1,3,5,7-tetravinyltetramethyltetracyclosiloxane which is used as the component (D) in the present invention is described in the examples.

Meanwhile, Fehn et al. state in column 9, lines 65-67 "The inhibitor content of the composition of the invention is preferably from 0 to 50,000 ppm, particularly preferably from 0 to 1,500 ppm, in particular from 5 to 600 ppm."

Thus Fehn et al. disclose that the content of the inhibitor is 0 to 5 wt% which is the widest range overlapped with the content (0.1 to 40 wt%) of the component (D) in the present invention. Fehn et al. teach that the content is particularly preferably 0.0005 to 0.06 wt% which is outside the content of the component (D) in the present invention.

The inhibitors disclosed by Fehn et al. serve to adjust, in a targeted way, the processing time, start temperature and crossing rate of the composition (see column 9, lines 43-45). Fehn et al. fail

Claims 8-13 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Fehn et al. in view of Suzuki et al. Suzuki et al. fail to remedy the deficiencies of Fehn et al. Accordingly, this ground of rejection is deemed to be overcome in view of the reasons described above.

In these Comparative Examples, very low adhesive strength was obtained as compared with the Examples of the present invention. Particularly in Comparative Example G where 1,3,5,7-tetravinyltetramethylteracyclosiloxane was used in an amount recommended by Fehm et al., sufficiently high adhesive strength was not obtained. Since the comparison between the instant invention and Fehm et al. is commensurate in scope with the claims as described above, it is respectfully submitted that the showing in the Declaration is sufficient to overcome the rejection.

The Declaration shows adhesive strengths (shear strengths) obtained when some of the examples of the inhibitor disclosed in column 9, lines 43-64 of Fehn et al., that is, (1) 1-ethylcyclohexanol, (2) tetravinylmethyldisiloxane, (3) diallyl malate, (4) diallyl fumarate, (5) cumene hydperoxide and (6) 1,3,5,7-tetravinyltetramethylcyclotetrasiloxane were added to the composition of Example 6 of Fehn et al. in amounts of 5 wt% (in the case of the inhibitors (1) to (5)) and 0.005 wt% (in the case of the inhibitor (6)) (Comparative Examples B, C, D, E, F and G).

## In re the Declaration

to disclose or suggest that excellent adhesion is achieved by the composition containing the component (D) of the present invention when the inhibitor is used.

July 30, 2003

Faximile (202) 721-8250

Telephone (202) 721-8200

Washington, D.C. 20006-1021

WMC/abm

Atto

re

ry

for

App

lic

an

ts

Att

or

me

for

Appl

ic

an

ts

Att

or

me

for

Appl